

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES  
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**



**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2005  
CITY HALL KIVA  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:03 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Chairman Mark Gilliland  
Vice-Chairman Brian Davis  
Commissioner Michael Bruz  
Commissioner J. David Hill  
Commissioner Kelly McCall  
Commissioner Matthew Taunton

ABSENT: Commissioner William Howard

STAFF PRESENT: Debra Astin, Transit Manager  
Kroy Ekblaw, Executive Assistant Strategic Projects  
Harriett Fortner, Transportation Secretary  
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning & Transit Director  
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager  
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

- Study Session of the Transportation Commission—October 20, 2005
- Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission—October 20, 2005

Commissioner Davis noted a typo on the second paragraph of page 5, which begins "Vice Chairman Davis asked what the implications of the City would be." This should be "what the implications to the City would be."

He also had a question about the second to last paragraph on page 4. He is not sure of the meaning of "this was omitted to minimize pouring in the area."

Ms. O'Connor responded that it should be "paving" and not "pouring".

Commissioner McCall said that on page 3 she does not understand a sentence in the sixth paragraph: "He noted the caveat that State Land has to be fully bought into this process."

Ms. O'Connor said that it should say, "State Land has to be brought into this process."

Commissioner McCall asked for clarification about the motion made by Commissioner Howard on page 5. Vice-Chairman Davis said that the Commission had voted on that motion and it was carried by a vote of four to one.

Commissioner McCall noted that multiplying the ridership of the trolley by the cost per passenger, she arrived at a total of roughly \$400,000. She noted that at the top of page 8 the annual cost for the trolley service is given as \$900,000. Ms. O'Connor explained that last year the trolley was seasonal, and this year the trolley began a year-round service. The current year's budget is increased accordingly.

**COMMISSIONER MCCALL MADE A MOTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2005 BE ACCEPTED WITH CORRECTIONS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).**

4. **132<sup>nd</sup> STREET/SHEA IMPROVEMENTS**

Discuss and review Mayo Clinic's request for a variance to the Shea Access Policy to allow a median break and future traffic signal at 132<sup>nd</sup> Street/Shea—Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

Mr. Porell presented the staff report. Highlights of the presentation included slides of the Shea Boulevard Access Policy, the Streets Master Plan, the current request—by Mayo Clinic and an aerial of 132nd & Shea Boulevard. The analysis performed reveals that this is an appropriate location for a median break and that eventually a traffic signal will be warranted.

Mr. John Berry of the law firm of Berry & Damore, 6750 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, addressed the meeting. He noted that most of Shea Boulevard is developed, so the likelihood of this setting a precedent is minimal. The Mayo Clinic Medical Research Campus is a unique land use in the City.

Noting that there were no comment cards on this agenda item, Chairman Gilliland invited Commissioners' comments.

Commissioner Davis asked whether an eastbound left turn out of the site at 132nd & Shea is a possibility in the future. Mr. Porell replied that the initial median opening would allow only eastbound left turns into 132nd Street. Currently the 132nd Street driveway is right in, right out. Once volumes increase at that location to warrant a traffic signal, full movement would be allowed.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Bruz, Mr. Porell confirmed that the reason for considering a left turn in that direction is because traffic primarily approaches from the west. Additional access to and from the east is not needed initially.

Commissioner Bruz asked whether the traffic consultant determined that adding the new median opening would assist in better traffic distribution. Mr. Porell explained that the new opening will draw some of the left-turn movements that currently take place at 130th and 134th Streets.

Commissioner Bruz noted that if a signal is warranted there in the future, the signals would only be a quarter of a mile apart. Mr. Porell said that staff anticipates that the signal spacing along this section of Shea Boulevard will operate as a subset of the traffic signal system.

In response to comments by Commissioner Hill, Mr. Porell explained that this is a diagrammatic sketch. Initially the median opening will be built to only accommodate eastbound left turns. When this intersection is signalized, the configuration would allow eastbound left-turn movements out of 132nd Street.

Commissioner McCall asked Mr. Berry to explain how the policy was developed in the mid-Nineties when he was a member of the Transportation Commission.

Mr. Berry cited that through traffic was a major concern for Scottsdale at that time. Shea Boulevard is the only major east-west connector to the Beeline Highway. The possibility of placing major shopping centers on Shea Boulevard was discussed. Mr. Berry noted that the population and traffic projections made at the time were higher than they have turned out to be. He recalled that the hope and desire was really to allow traffic to move freely along Shea. Now Shea is built out and the land uses are known. His recollection is that the Commission was trying to anticipate the growth they knew would come on that corridor.

Ms. O'Connor noted that very few of the staff members present were here when the policy was established in 1995, but that policies like the expressway policy will be reexamined in the Transportation Master Plan process that is about to begin. Mr. Berry recalled that in 1995, the Transportation Commission was required to look at every traffic signal and make a recommendation before they were installed. The Commission's task and jurisdiction was much different ten years ago.

Commissioner McCall opined that it is still a priority to keep traffic moving along Shea Boulevard. Traffic slows below the speed limit where traffic lights are installed close together. She has doubts about installing another traffic signal at the location. She referred to a map held up by Commissioner Hill and inquired about alternate access roads into the area.

Mr. Berry referred to an overview diagram depicting potential future access points. He noted that in 1995, City Council intended that Via Linda would be built to provide secondary east-west access to Fountain Hills. That has since been changed. The Research Center will be a 3.8 million square foot campus with Shea Boulevard as its only access road. There is a need to balance traffic flow

with synchronized signals and intelligent transportation options to handle the traffic that this site will generate. Keeping traffic out of neighborhoods is a key concern.

Commissioner McCall asked why the Research Center is so different than the other commercial property that has been developed on Shea, where driveways onto Shea are minimized. This site already has three entrances and now there is a request to add a fourth entrance. She noted that traffic would not be going into neighborhoods because there are walls around the homes.

Mr. Berry noted that Kierland Commons is 1.2 million square feet and the Research Center will be 3.8 million square feet. The Center will draw scientists and visitors from all over the world and having inadequate access would make a bad impression. This is a substantial development, and the transportation infrastructure needs to be in place. According to the TIMA report and staff, this signal does not materially change the level of service; does not materially change the delays associated with traffic at the intersection; and has a very positive impact on a major user for the Scottsdale community.

Ms. O'Connor added that one of the reasons staff will be reexamining this policy and similar policies in the transportation master plan is that often no other alternatives were allowed in the original policy. In this particular case, the site is a destination. The need for the proposed change has been fully documented but the policy requires the Commission to approve the change. Staff are working on improvements to Shea Boulevard intersections. She noted that great strides have been made in signal timing and coordination since 1995.

Mr. Porell added that staff have reviewed the site as a whole and concluded that if additional access is not provided, there would be fairly significant degradation in levels of service at the alternative access points and those intersections would become overloaded. By distributing access, the level of service can be maintained.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner McCall, Mr. Porell reported that the speed limit would likely not need to be decreased. By distributing the traffic and timing the traffic signals properly, the efficiency of Shea would be improved. The green lights for the side streets would be shorter than for Shea Boulevard.

Commissioner McCall asked how he saw this different than the cluster of traffic lights near Scottsdale Healthcare Shea. Mr. Porell replied that the volume of traffic on Shea Boulevard near Scottsdale Healthcare is of considerably higher volume.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Davis, Mr. Berry reported that the number of people to be employed at the Research Center has yet to be determined. The Center will be less than the 4.8 million square feet that was originally planned to be developed at the site. Because it will be used for research, there will not be the volume of patients and visitor traffic found at a hospital.

Mr. Porell noted that staff consider trips generated to and from the site rather than the size of the workforce. Under the original plan to build a hospital at this site, the analysis predicted 104,000 trips per day. Under the proposed site plan and rezoning, the number drops down to approximately 21,000 trips per day.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner McCall and Mr. Porell to clarify the statistics, and identify current traffic flow at the site.

**COMMISSIONER HILL MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ENDORSE MAYO CLINIC'S REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO THE SHEA ACCESS POLICY TO ALLOW THIS MEDIAN BREAK AND FUTURE TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT 132ND STREET AND SHEA BOULEVARD.**

Commissioner Hill noted that Commissioner McCall's concerns are worth raising. However, in his opinion, for this terrific community resource and facility, this additional access point will be worthwhile. With proper traffic synchronization, traffic snarls will not be created.

**THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRUZ AND CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).**

5. **REQUEST TO MODIFY STREETS MASTER PLAN**

Continued discussion and take action on the proposal by Land Development Services, L.L.C. to remove a portion of the Alameda Road extension between the 122<sup>nd</sup> Street alignment and 128<sup>th</sup> Street from the City's Streets Classification Map—Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director

Mr. Dave Meinhart introduced the item. He noted that if the Transportation Commission approves the request, it would also require approval by City Council. The Applicant was asked to do some follow-up with some of the concerned citizens who spoke at last month's meeting. Staff propose that, should this request be recommended, there be a condition that the streets master plan would not be amended until the alternative east-west corridor is constructed, and that public trail access be provided across the site, as well as emergency vehicular access.

Mr. John Berry addressed the meeting, presenting an overview of the issues and an aerial photo. At the previous meeting, the Commission requested that the Applicant take additional time to perform further outreach in the area.

Mr. Berry noted that the establishment of the McDowell Sonoran Desert Preserve has resulted in a material change to the traffic context for this area. He referred to a Traffic Analysis slide, citing that as a result of the Preserve efforts and the development in the area, current predictions are that area traffic will be reduced by approximately 33%.

The Applicant is requesting that Alameda Road be removed and a more centrally located access road be provided instead. Mr. Berry recalled inquiries at the previous meeting relative to the community benefits. The Applicant is planning to build Ranch Gate Road sooner than planned, at their expense. The Applicant

will also pay for and accelerate construction of the connection of 118th Street to Jomax.

Noting that City staff had considered emergency access before bringing this request to the Commission, he displayed a map developed by the Applicant, denoting the location of the new Fire Station 614 on Alma School Road. He pointed out the current routes from the Fire Station to the neighborhood, which are distances of 5.2 and 5.3 miles. If the request is approved, the distance will be shortened to 4.7 miles.

Mr. Berry noted that at the previous meeting there were questions related to trails and bikes. Referring to a slide of Proposed Public Trail Alignments, he identified existing required public trails on the City's master plan. Developers will be required to install the trails as projects develop.

Mr. Berry noted a discussion on October 20 about what is happening on Alameda Road. The Applicant is proposing and is prepared to stipulate to provide public access through the community for walkers and bicycles.

Mr. Berry spoke about the balance of traffic in the area. The current forecast for the traffic volume on Alameda is 6,760 ADT (average daily traffic). If this request is granted, traffic volume on Alameda would go down to 3,850 ADT.

Mr. Berry mentioned that the October 20th meeting demonstrated that there is a great deal of support from the area homeowners. He referred to a color map depicting the Eastern Edge of Property/State Land/Mountain Preserve Addition and denoted ownership patterns. There is one landowner, Mr. Maniotis, who owns 49 percent of the vacant land in the east. The Applicant is not aware of any homes built in the eastern area. Mr. Maniotis has expressed support for this change.

Mr. Berry identified parcels that are owned by non-residents, which represents 33 percent of the land to the east. A total of 82 percent of the land east of the project is either owned by Mr. Maniotis or by individuals who live outside Arizona. The remaining 18 percent is owned by 26 individual landowners who are Arizona residents, although no homes have been built.

Mr. Berry's understanding is that all City departments have reviewed this project, and staff is supportive of this request.

Chairman Gilliland reviewed and summarized the comment cards from members of the public who did not wish to speak. Ten cards were from people in favor of the proposal: Mr. Patrick McDonald, Mr. James Mann, Ms. Sandra Fisher, Ben & Carol Boles, R. W. Kreutel, Ms. Nancy Eris, Leilani and Mike Brown, and Ms. Rochelle Gatt. Three cards were from people opposed to the proposal: Ms. Teresa Kleiner, Mr. Moshe Bar, and Mr. Merle Hinrich.

The following individuals spoke to the Commission:

Mr. Robert Jackson of 14902 North Scottsdale Road is a project manager for AIS Properties, Inc., expressing opposition to the proposal. Referring to the aerial diagram, he said that the road closure would benefit one developer to the detriment of other property owners. He opined that the public has not been notified of the proposed extension of Ranch Gate Road. When AIS purchased their property in 2004, no one informed them that a public road would be built on their south property line. He asserted that if this happens, Sonoran Peaks, L.L.C. (his company) will be filing lawsuits against all parties to this action.

Mr. Jackson posed a number of questions, which included: Whether the property owners to the east of were publicly informed of the proposed change to Alameda Road; whether City officials have informed the public of the proposed change; and whether a traffic study has been completed.

He concluded that the State Land Department seems to be in favor of the new roadway. The City has not informed the public about the new roadway and has not responded to his company's request for more information.

Mr. Tim Miller of 11933 East Sand Hills Road addressed the meeting in favor of the proposed change, citing that at the last meeting he had left a petition with over a hundred signatures.

Mr. Steve Weinberg of 29511 North 140th Way addressed the meeting in favor of the proposed change, citing that the positives clearly seem to far outweigh the negatives.

Mr. Norbert Kleiner of 24867 North 119th Place addressed the meeting, expressing opposition to the proposed change. Mr. Kleiner provided a presentation to the Commission. He disputed the traffic statistics that have been quoted and opined that future residents of the Crown property will use Alameda Road whether it is gated or not because it is the most direct route out of the neighborhood. The proposed change is unnecessary and there are many things wrong with this proposal. Mr. Kleiner concluded that there are superior alternatives to the Ranch Gate Plan.

Mr. Steve Kensok of 11921 East Sand Hills Road addressed the meeting in favor of the proposed change.

Mr. Brian Coast of 11930 East Mariposa Grande addressed the meeting in favor of the proposed change. Noting that some homeowners are bothered by exhaust fumes as well as noise, he said that Alameda Road is not suitable for a high volume of traffic. The extension of Ranch Gate Road will better serve the community.

Mr. Steve Ravnitsky of 12050 East Chama Road spoke in opposition to the proposal. He said he was completely left out of the process. Although this is a proposal for a two-lane road, Carefree Highway was once a two-way road. The area where Ranch Gate would be built is a pristine desert sanctuary today. He

feels there are better alternatives and cited the nuisance of noise and light pollution that would result in his neighborhood.

Mr. René Eris of 23557 North 119th Way addressed the meeting in favor of the proposed change. He acknowledged that this is a difficult situation and noted that traffic in the area routinely ignores the speed limit. He feels that the Applicant has done a great job in making this proposal, which deserves serious consideration. He watched the October 20 meeting on television and was distressed that Commissioners voiced concerns in terms of the rights of the speculators who own land to the east of the Crown property. At the invitation of Chairman Gilliland, Commissioner Taunton opined that that was not the only reason for opposition at the last meeting. He added that the word "speculator" was never used in the meeting. Mr. Eris disputed that assertion.

Mr. Neil Dempster of 24573 North 119th Place spoke in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Dempster reviewed the master plan prior to purchasing his home and based his decision to purchase on the knowledge that they were safe from development. He had done due diligence and made a commitment based on information that was available at the time. Mr. Dempster disputed the emergency response time, noting that the response time to homes south of the proposed extension of Ranch Gate Road would actually increase. He believes that this proposal is to the detriment of many people and benefits few. He added that he had only become aware of the proposal thanks to the efforts of Mr. Kleiner.

Commissioner Bruz asked Ms. O'Connor to confirm that as things presently stand, when a developer comes into an area they would be required to extend Alameda Road, but not necessarily exactly on the line shown on the streets master plan. Ms. O'Connor agreed that this is essentially correct.

In response to resident comments regarding noise and environmental studies, Commissioner Bruz inquired regarding the use of such studies. Ms. O'Connor replied that environmental studies are generally required when the City is involved in Federally funded projects. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Bruz, Ms. O'Connor explained that when the City widens a roadway, analysis is performed to determine the noise impacts on existing homeowners and whether mitigation is warranted.

Mr. Meinhart added that because this area is under the City's Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance, designs for Ranch Gate Road would be reviewed by the Planning Department. He outlined the volume and speed of traffic that produces noise levels that require mitigation for City roadway projects, noting that a two-lane roadway with 3,000 vehicles a day would not come close to the 64 decibel level at which the City mitigates noise.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Bruz regarding emergency response times for people south of the project, Mr. Meinhart reported that the City asked that the Crown site provide emergency access to the properties to the south. The proposal would not change anything for the properties to the south.



Commissioner Bruz asked Mr. Berry whether the developer had ever looked at opportunities to carry Alameda Road through the site. Mr. Berry noted that the first plan was a typical subdivision that did not require the developer to come before the Commission. The idea for closing Alameda Road had come from the community members, who wanted to have balanced traffic patterns in the area. The benefits of the proposal far outweigh the costs. The developer has spent the past year working with community members to try and reach a win-win solution, which has delayed construction on the Crown property.

At the request of Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart reviewed the history of the Ranch Gate Road alignment. Roadways that are smaller than minor collectors are not covered by the streets master plan. Part of the alignment runs across State land and could be acquired upon State Land putting the property up for sale. The Applicant has taken the initiative to approach the State Land Department.

In response to inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Berry replied that the owner of the property to the east, Mr. Bar, was in attendance and that Mr. Jackson, who represents him, had addressed the meeting earlier. Mr. Bar's property is not affected by the proposal because an easement for Ranch Gate Road already exists along the southern edge of his property.

Chairman Gilliland requested staff commentary. Mr. Meinhart agreed with Mr. Berry, citing that the City has already set Ranch Gate as an alignment for a future two-lane road.

Mr. Jackson acknowledged awareness of the right-of-way and understands the rules of platting. They understood 118th Street would be built, but were not planning to build East Ranch Gate Road. His company is prepared to make improvements if the City requires this. When notified by a letter from Crown's community outreach firm, they responded asking them to get in touch for further discussions but no one got back to them. They had also asked the City's Planning staff for a meeting and not received a response.

Chairman Gilliland asked what the negative impacts will be. Mr. Jackson said they have not yet platted or planned their subdivision, but they had planned to connect to 118th Street. Mr. Berry has submitted a right-of-way application to the State for the roadway.

Mr. Berry stated that the harm to Mr. Bar's property is that he will be required to dedicate and improve the right-of-way at his cost when he plats the property. Crown is going to pay for the construction and upkeep of the roadway along Ranch Gate Road and for the improvements on 118th Street.

Upon comments from the floor by Mr. Dempster, discussion ensued regarding the protocols for speakers to follow during the meeting.

Commissioner McCall remarked that the community outreach to the homes along Alameda Road was done very nicely, but tonight she is hearing that there are other communities in the neighborhood of the proposed extension of East Ranch Gate Road that were not contacted.

Mr. Berry explained that the developer held neighborhood meetings, went door to door and did several mailings and presented a map highlighting the City's notifications.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner McCall regarding an environmental impact study, Ms. O'Connor explained that these roadways are projected to have less than 5,000 vehicles average daily traffic. Environmental impact analysis is geared towards roadways with higher volumes and impacts, as Mr. Meinhart stated earlier. If a study were undertaken, there would be nothing comparable to benchmark it against. Staff tries to work with all stakeholders to come up with a roadway system that will be acceptable.

Commissioner McCall expressed concerns about construction traffic disrupting the neighborhood. Ms. O'Connor noted that construction traffic is always negative for residents, it is a temporary condition and would not justify doing an environmental impact analysis. She clarified that Mr. Jackson's comments have never been addressed to Transportation staff. Staff have never been asked for any information on this and were unaware of his concerns. Staff have been working with Mr. Kleiner and others.

Commissioner Davis noted that one of the reasons the Commission did not take a decision on October 20 was due to the desire to obtain additional public comment. There was some discussion in the study session that having the alignment next to or through the Preserve is not desirable.

Mr. Meinhart acknowledged that the exhibit Mr. Kleiner presented was an idea that had been discussed. Input obtained from the Preserve staff indicated that they were uncomfortable with this idea. He noted that the McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission also has guidelines intended to minimize the number of roads adjacent to the Preserve boundaries.

In response to a request by Commissioner Davis, Mr. Meinhart confirmed that no additional Preserve land is planned in that area. It is expected that at some point the State land that is not identified as Preserve will be sold for future development.

Commissioner Davis noted discussions that at least half of the street right-of-way for East Ranch Gate Road has been dedicated for a road. The proposed change would make a connection to 128th Street.

Mr. Meinhart confirmed and explained that the Applicant is negotiating with the State Land Department to acquire the rights to be able to build the roadway. The State has not yet made a formal development plan, but has given support to this alignment.

In reply to a follow-up question from Commissioner Davis, Mr. Meinhart confirmed that a 27-foot wide right-of-way is already dedicated. This represents the south half of the road, plus some additional right-of-way for a trail.

Commissioner Davis remarked that the two property owners are apparently not in agreement. He asked whether Ranch Gate Road could be built without

additional right-of-way. Mr. Meinhart stated that a minimum of 24 feet of drivable surface is required for a road of this size.

Commissioner Davis asked how the private property is going to be obtained. Mr. Meinhart replied that there is certainly room for more negotiations. The Applicant could construct the road on the 27 feet currently dedicated and build the trail to the north. He added that the Applicant has undertaken to build 118th Street north to Jomax.

Commissioner Davis asked about the current traffic count for Alameda Road, given the construction in the neighborhood. Mr. Meinhart replied that the latest counts are 2,700 vehicles per day on Alameda Road east of 118th street.

Commissioner Hill commented that this has been a long and serious discussion and is not an easy decision. At this time he would vote not to change the streets master plan. Commissioner Hill noted that there are numerous stakeholders whose commitments and investments were based upon existing plans. Eventually the streets master plan will be changed. He believes that Crown Properties' efforts and good work will very likely come to fruition in some manner. He would not rush to vote in a change to the streets master plan, but rather would wait for it to evolve. He thanked everyone who has participated in this.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Taunton, Mr. Berry confirmed that the assumptions made in the trip generation statistics previously quoted assumed that Ranch Gate Road was built and that Alameda was gated.

In response to further inquiry, Mr. Porell speculated that if Alameda was to be constructed as a public street connecting to 128<sup>th</sup> Street, the projected volume of traffic would be 6,000 vehicles per day. With the additional developments north of the Crown project that would use the East Ranch Gate alignment, volumes would be a lot less if Alameda were not a public street.

Commissioner Taunton opined that that is one of the crucial issues that has not been addressed and suggested that it would be very helpful to figure out what will happen to the area east of 128th Street in the long-term. He queried why the developer would not consider keeping Alameda as a public street, noting that gates could be placed within the site, rather than closing off a planned minor arterial. He believes that some of the congestion issues along Alameda Road will be mitigated when East Ranch Gate Road is built.

Mr. Berry reminded the Commission that if this proposal is approved, the developer has agreed to improve as a half street and make a connection from Jomax to where 118th Street now ends. The developer has also agreed to immediately install the connection to 128th Street, at the developer's expense.

Commissioner Taunton disagrees somewhat that closing that roadway to public access is better for the transportation infrastructure. Ideally, it is preferable that Alameda Road remain public, and East Ranch Gate Road also be constructed.

Chairman Gilliland invited Mr. Dempster to speak.

Mr. Dempster apologized for his earlier statement from the floor. He said it appears to him that the City may have made some errors in judgment in planning this neighborhood. Mr. Kleiner proposed an alternative that should be taken into consideration. The route that residents would have to take if Alameda Road is closed is quite circuitous. Alameda Road is the most direct route and people will not give up driving the direct route. Referring to the fire response map, Mr. Dempster queried the distances that Mr. Berry had quoted.

Mr. Berry replied with an explanation of how the Applicant had determined the distances for emergency response time, stressing that Scottsdale emergency vehicles can immediately enter any gated community.

Commissioner Bruz expressed concern about providing adequate access to the four parcels at the northwest corner of the Crown property. He wanted to make sure that the Applicant has talked to those people and resolved the concerns.

Mr. Berry acknowledged that members of the Applicant's team had met with and exchanged correspondence with those property owners of the four parcels. In fact, two of those property owners who were in opposition at the last Commission meeting, are in attendance tonight in support of this agenda item.

Commissioner Davis asked staff to confirm that Crown is responsible for obtaining all the right-of-way. Ms. O'Connor affirmed, noting that part of the stipulation would be that if this roadway is not built, the Alameda alignment will be required to connect to 128<sup>th</sup> St.

Commissioner Davis expressed concerns about the Applicant building a full street, not a half street. Mr. Berry assured the Commission that the road will be a two-lane road, just as Alameda is today.

Commissioner Davis noted that the application to the Planning Commission mentions trailheads for private trails. He asked whether that would change if the Transportation Commission recommends the change to the streets master plan. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that public trail access would be stipulated if the Transportation Commission recommends the change.

Commissioner Davis said it has been mentioned that people in this development will continue to take Alameda. He feels that Ranch Gate Road would be used more by future subdivisions. Mr. Meinhart affirmed, citing that the traffic projections that are being developed assume that the majority of traffic from the Crown development site would use Alameda Road.

Commissioner Davis remarked that he is inclined to support this proposal, with some of the stipulations.

Chairman Gilliland clarified that the motion would be of general support for the proposal, with *the stipulations that 118th Street and East Gate Ranch Road be constructed prior to the closure of Alameda; and that public trail access and emergency vehicular access be provided across the development site.*

Mr. Berry suggested that if the Commission moves forward with a motion, *that they also include that this segment of Alameda Road not be deleted from the streets master plan until whatever condition the Commission sees fit has been met.*

**CHAIRMAN GILLILAND MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND A CHANGE TO THE STREETS MASTER PLAN WITH THE STIPULATIONS AND CONDITIONS NOTED ABOVE. COMMISSIONER DAVIS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO TWO (2). COMMISSIONERS HILL AND TAUNTON DISSENTED.**

Discussion ensued regarding the appropriateness of a motion made by the Chairman. Whereupon,

**COMMISSIONER MCCALL MADE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER. COMMISSIONER BRUZ SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).**

**VICE-CHAIRMAN DAVIS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THIS REQUEST , INCLUDING THE CONDITIONS INCLUDED WITH THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRUZ AND CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO TWO (2). COMMISSIONERS HILL AND TAUNTON DISSENTED.**

6. **DRAFT FY 2006/07 OPERATING BUDGET PRIORITIZATION OF TRANSIT (Information/Possible Action)**

Commission will review and provide input to prioritize proposed transit system improvements for FY 2006/07—Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director; Debra Astin, Transit Manager

Chairman Gilliland noted that three more items remained on the agenda. Ms. O'Connor advised the Commission that they have the option to continue these items to the December meeting. She noted that agenda item #7 will be brought back again. It would be possible to hear Ms. Astin's presentation for information and share feedback at a later meeting.

Ms. Debra Astin, Transit Manager, gave a presentation. She noted that FY 2006/2007 will be the first full year that the City receives Proposition 400 funds. Highlights of her PowerPoint presentation included slides depicting Staff Recommendations for Transit Service Improvements; Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities; Fixed Route Services; Circulator Services; Other Potential Improvements; Prop 400 Transit Operating Improvements/20 Years; and Recommended Improvements Chart.

Commissioner McCall thanked Ms. Astin for her presentation. Commissioner McCall asked about the fees for users of Dial-a-Ride and Cab Connection. Ms. Astin replied with details of the fee structure.

Commissioner McCall asked her to explain her statement during the presentation that Cab Connection costs half as much as Dial-A-Ride. Ms. Astin clarified that when she stated a cost per passenger, she meant the cost to the City.

In response to further inquiry by Commissioner McCall, Ms. Astin reported that Cab Connection is less costly to passengers for short trips.

Commissioner McCall asked about the advance notice needed to use both of the services. Ms. Astin explained that Dial-A-Ride can be set up to two weeks in advance and no later than the day before the trip. Users can request a same-day trip but there are no guarantees because of capacity. Cab Connection works differently. The vouchers are issued to specific destinations selected in advance by the rider. Dial-A-Ride can be used by visitors if they qualify under the Americans With Disabilities Act. Cab Connection can be used by long-term visitors.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Hill regarding routes 84 and 114 Ms. Astin supplied details.

Commissioner Hill asked why staff declined to recommend some potential improvements. Ms. Astin noted that reasons include low ridership; Routes 84 and 114 need further study before staff can make recommendations to improve them. The Dial-A-Ride north of Bell Road is an area where Cab Connection is currently operating and it meets a large majority of the needs of that area. Adding Dial-A-Ride in the area could be costly due to the long distances involved. The trolley service was essentially almost doubled this year. Staff felt that these improvements could be set aside for a future year.

Commissioner Hill referred to the chart: Proposition 400 Transit Operating Improvements. Ms. Astin confirmed that local routes (those only within Scottsdale limits) are not receiving operating funds from Proposition 400 funds. Referring to the slide of Recommended Improvements, Commissioner Hill asked where the baseline cost of \$7,786,000 came from. Ms. Astin noted that that amount represents the estimated cost of existing services for FY 06-07, plus inflation.

Commissioner Hill noted that the City transit system is set to begin receiving Proposition 400 monies. In response to inquiry on where the additional funding for proposed transit service improvements will come from, Mr. Meinhart noted that the City splits the two-tenths transportation privilege tax equally between operations and capital. Most of the operations funding goes into transit services. There will be roughly \$2 million in additional local transportation sales tax available in FY 06-07 to split between transit operations and capital improvements.

Commissioner Hill asked about the figures in the cumulative costs column and the projected ridership. Ms. Astin explained that staff estimate 406,000 additional riders will be brought into the system the first year after improvements are made. Baseline ridership today is approximately 2.4 million.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Hill regarding current cost per rider, Ms. Astin displayed a slide showing the cost of existing services.

Commissioner Taunton expressed confusion about the proposed weekday frequency increases. Ms. Astin explained that Route 106 has a few trips during the day that do not match the Phoenix side of the route. Route 41 currently operates hourly in most of Scottsdale, but operates on a 15-minute peak and a 30-minute off-peak west from Phoenix up to Loloma. Under the recommended improvements, Scottsdale would match the 30-minute service level. She provided details regarding Saturday service and trolley service.

Commissioner Taunton asked whether the Department has received any comments from seniors about a preference for a low-floor vehicle as opposed to the trolley. Ms. Astin noted outreach regarding the neighborhood circulator route has not begun; however, the trolley is intended to be very user-friendly.

Upon inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Ms. Astin confirmed receiving the input needed.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Hill, Ms. Astin noted that staff did not propose any improvements to express routes. They are regional routes and will be improved under Proposition 400. Mr. Meinhart clarified that funding of the existing express route system will be taken over by Proposition 400, and new express routes will be added per the Proposition 400 funding schedule. He noted that staff is required to submit operating budget decision packages to the Budget Office in the first week of December. Commissioner Hill expressed pleasure that this budget seems to be going in the right direction on City transit investment. Proposition 400 is a major factor. He would be willing to offer a motion of endorsement to support staff's recommendations. He asked staff to confirm that they are not aware of any planned cuts to the City's contribution to the express routes.

Mr. Meinhart confirmed that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Davis commented that figuring out where best to improve the system is a lot of work. He noted that for some of the routes, the per-passenger cost quoted in the packet is rather high and asked whether that is due to first year costs. Ms. Astin explained that the cost per passenger has several components (length of the route, varying contract costs, and time of day factors). For example, evening ridership is lower than daytime but evening service is needed so people can ride the bus to work and be able to stay late. The different elements should be considered as parts of a whole system. She added that these are the costs for the first year. Not all of the ridership comes in the first year.

Vice-Chairman Davis expressed concerns about ensuring that the improvements can be maintained. Ms. Astin clarified that the windfall Mr. Meinhart had spoken of consists of a one-time resetting of the base budget. There should be no problem maintaining the proposed level of service.

**COMMISSIONER HILL MADE A MOTION THAT THIS COMMISSION  
ENDORSE THE RECOMMENDED OPERATING BUDGET PRIORITIZATION  
OF TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS AS PRESENTED BY MS. ASTIN. THE**

**MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAUNTON AND CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).**

7. **DRAFT FY 2006/07—2010/11 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM** (Information)

Commission will review proposed capital improvement program budget submittals. This item will be reviewed for action before February 2006—Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director

Mr. Meinhart addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included: Draft CIP Fiscal Year Trends; Transportation Funding Sources Pie Chart; Fiscal Years 2006-2011 New Projects Map; Continuing Programs; and Funding by Program Area--\$271 Million total Pie Chart.

Commissioner Taunton noted that other jurisdictions have experienced significant delays caused by problems of obtaining supplies for road building projects. Mr. Meinhart acknowledged experiencing some effects from the supply side.

Commissioner Hill thanked Mr. Meinhart for the good detail in the report, which is very helpful to the Commission.

Upon inquiry by Vice-Chairman Davis regarding the status of sales tax funding, Mr. Meinhart answered that approximately \$37 million is available in fund balance due to the timing of expenditures.

In response to further inquiry by Vice-Chairman Davis regarding the maintainable funding level, Mr. Meinhart reported that there is approximately \$9.5 million annually in sales tax for capital improvements. Staff anticipates that capital improvements will mostly be done through bonding. Additional funds will come to the City in future years from Proposition 400, for improving arterial roads.

8. **CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES** (Information)

Update on transportation projects including but not limited to Transportation Master Plan and Loop 101 Photo Enforcement Demonstration Program—Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager

Ms. O'Connor mentioned that two projects are currently under way.

Ms. Huish is managing the consultant team on the transportation master plan. This process will take 12 to 18 months. The existing streets master plan, bicycle and pedestrian plan, and transit plan will all be updated. In addition, a new stand-alone pedestrian plan and separate area studies including Air Park Circulation and High Capacity Transit Technology Selection. The team will be asked to look at a variety of hot topics.

After a study session and final City Council approval as of October 25, staff were authorized to begin work on a demonstration photo enforcement program for the 101. She outlined the details of the program. A staff team is putting together a Technical Advisory Committee. Staff will continue to provide information on the progress of the project. A public open house is being planned for early December.



9. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

None

10. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
A/V Tronics, Inc.

**LIST OF INDIVIDUALS WHO FILLED OUT CARDS:**

***NON-SPEAKERS:***

1. Patrick McDonald, 11865 E. Parkview Lane, in Favor of #5
2. James Mann, 11923 E. Parkview Lane, 85255, in Favor of #5
3. Sandra Fisher, 3434 E. Campo Bello, Phoenix 85032, in Favor of #5
4. Ben & Carol Boles, 26204 N. 11<sup>th</sup> Ave., Phoenix 85027, in Favor of #5
5. R.W. Kreutel, 11696 E. Sand Hills Rd., 85255
6. Nancy Eris, 23557 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Way, 85255, in Favor of #5
7. Leilani & Mike Brown, 23493 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Way, 85255, both in Favor of #5
8. Moshe Bar, 7862 E. Aster Dr., 85260, Opposed to #5
9. Merle Hinrich, 14901 N. Scottsdale Rd. #201, 85254, Opposed to #5
10. Rochelle Gatt, 11934 E. Troon Vista Way, 85255, in Favor of #5
11. Teresa Kleiner, 24867 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Place, 85255, Opposed to #5

***SPEAKERS:***

1. Robert A. Jackson (represents Moshe Bar), Sonoran Hills LLC, 14901 N. Scottsdale Rd., 85254, Opposed to #5
2. Tim Miller, 11933 E. Sand Hills Rd., in Favor of #5 Closing
3. Steve Weinberg, 29511 N. 140<sup>th</sup> Way, 85262, in Favor of #5
4. Norbert Kleiner, Homeowner Group, 24867 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Place, 85255, Opposed to #5
5. Steve Kensok, 11921 E. Sand Hills Rd., 85255, in favor of #5 Closing
6. Brian Coast, 11930 E. Mariposa Grande, 85255, in Favor of #5
7. Steve Ravnitsky, 12050 E. Chama Rd., 85255, Opposed to Crown Dev.
8. Mr. René L. Eris, 23557 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Way, in Favor of #5
9. Neil Dempster, 24573 N. 119<sup>th</sup> Place, 85255, Opposed to #5

**\*NOTE: Video and/or audio recordings of Scottsdale Transportation Commission meetings are available from the Scottsdale Transportation Department for up to six months following the meeting date.**